

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action, dated January 7, 2004, the Examiner states that Claims 1-5 are pending, Claims 1-5 are rejected and Claims 6-19 are withdrawn from consideration. By the present Amendment, Applicant amends the claims.

In the Office Action, the Examiner confirms the election to Claims 1-5 without traverse. The Applicant affirms this election.

In the Office Action, Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Osawa et al. (US 6,071,443). Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osawa in view of Warino et al. (US 6,382,956) and Hasuo et al. (US 4,775,739). The Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections in view of the amendment to Claim 1.

The Applicant has amended Claim 1 to incorporate the feature of Claim 5, that the temperature of the forming die is adjusted to a suitable temperature, and that the temperature is adjusted by blowing hot air on the forming die. Support for adjusting the temperature by blowing hot air on the forming die is found at page 10, line 11 through page 11, line 1 of the specification.

None of the cited prior art references disclose, teach or suggest adjusting the temperature of the forming die by blowing hot air. By adjusting the temperature in this way by blowing hot air, the solvent contained in the ionizing radiation curing type resin is removed. This has the advantage of preventing bubbles from being entrapped in the lens.

In view of this amendment, the Applicant considers the rejections to the claims overcome.

In light of the foregoing response, all the outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that this

application should now be in better condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

April 5, 2004

Date

Brian W. Hameder

Attorney for Applicant  
Brian W. Hameder  
c/o Ladas & Parry  
224 South Michigan Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60604  
(312) 427-1300  
Reg. No. 45613